DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 002 PS 021 132

TITLE International Youth Foundation Program Identification System. Pilot Study One: Analysis and Recommendations.

INSTITUTION Moss (William L.) and Associates, Ltd., Alexandria, VA.

PUB DATE 30 Aug 91

NOTE 42p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Children; *Evaluation Criteria; Foreign Countries; Interpersonal Competence; Personality Development; *Pilot Projects; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Research Problems; Surveys; Testing Problems; Young Adults; *Youth Programs

IDENTIFIERS Australia; Brazil; Denmark; Germany; Kenya; Lesotho; Malaysia; Portugal; Trinidad and Tobago; Uganda; United States

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of Round One of a pilot study of a system for identifying effective youth organizations around the world is presented in this report. The report begins with a page of general observations about the successes and shortcomings of the pilot study, indicating that in general the study accomplished its objectives but that a need for modifications in the process and improvement of the instruments of the study are needed, as will be addressed in Round Two. A general analysis of problems with the instruments and suggestions for improvement follows. Typical questions that foundations and organizations are likely to ask before agreeing to assist in the study are then given, together with appropriate answers, and these are followed by the forms used for program nominations showing selection process, program criteria, and evaluation criteria. This section is followed by a summary of the study's results, which provides a breakdown of the characteristics of the 27 programs nominated by the study participants. A list of the names and addresses of the seven participating organizations is then provided. For each organization, the names of the programs nominated by that organization with, in each case, the name of a contact person and a one-sentence description of the program are included. The next section of the document includes reports that indicate how many of the organizations' programs matched the criteria used in the evaluation and to what degree. The document ends with a section of analysis matrices. (ME)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED355002

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INTERNATIONAL YOUTH FOUNDATION

PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM PILOT STUDY ONE

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

August 30, 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William L. Moss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared By

WLM

WILLIAM L. MOSS
& ASSOCIATES, LTD.
International Organizational Development & Professional Management Consultant
1409 Prince Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

For More Information: Tel. 703-683-3467, FAX 703-683-3574

PS 021132

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Observations

Analysis of Instrumentation

Round One Pilot Study Forms

Pilot Study Results

Round One Participants

Frequency Reports:

1. Program Evaluation Criteria
2. Evaluation Criteria

Analysis Matrices

General Observations

PILOT STUDY ONE
OF IYF'S
PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

August 26, 1991

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. Did the Pilot Study accomplish its objectives? Were IYF's purposes fulfilled?

Yes, the IYF Pilot Study did accomplish its objectives and purposes. . .but with some qualifications.

Our *primary* objectives for the Pilot Study were to test the credibility and effectiveness of IYF's process for obtaining program information and to check the value of IYF's criteria for identifying programs.

Based on our analysis, we believe Round One of the Pilot Study was reasonably successful in accomplishing these objectives. The process itself involved fairly positive responses. Most of the participants solicited for the study responded willingly and thoughtfully. The instruments proved useful and elicited positive responses.

It appears the participant NGO's and foundations understand IYF's program identification criteria. The program information submitted indicates IYF can expect its system to include a fairly wide range of programs and the needs they address. A larger pool of participants in Round Two can be expected to obtain more significant program information.

2. However, our analysis of the responses indicate a clear need to modify the process and improve the instruments used in the study. We discovered that some of the submissions really did not match IYF's general criteria. This may be explained by several flaws in the Pilot Study format and terminology. We will suggest changes in the procedures for the study, its format and terminology which we believe will enhance its effectiveness in Round Two.

Analysis of Instrumentation

ANALYSIS OF INSTRUMENTATION

General Observations.

1. Some of the terminology used in the Pilot Study documents may have created biased responses by overstating the benefits of participation in the study. It was perhaps unwise to suggest "inclusion in IYF's Information Clearinghouse" or that "replication funding" was an outcome for participating in the Pilot Study. The original intent in using these statements was to motivate "busy" participants to fill out the forms. We suspect that some programs submitted do not related to IYF's criteria or purposes because of an eagerness to obtain the rewards of participation. We need to find a way to motivate participants to respond without relying on these rewards.

2. Because Round One of the Pilot Study asks for so much qualitative and descriptive program information, we are concerned that less time and attention was devoted to the Program Criteria and Evaluation Criteria forms. The "Program Information" form and the "Selection Process" form seem more open-ended than necessary. While the information submitted was interesting and did provide some context for understanding the program, it would be difficult to obtain a meaningful categorization or comparison of the programs based on that data alone.

3. The questions asked by the Selection Process form have merit. We believe it would be more effective to collect this specific, qualitative data at a later point rather than in the Pilot Study. We also noticed that some of the responses seem to tell us more about the nominator's values and personal opinions than data about the program itself. Items 2, 3 and 4 are more likely to be meaningful when solicited in an interview or field visit.

Round One Pilot Study Forms

PILOT STUDY MATERIALS

In this packet you will find a basic set of materials for our Pilot Study. These include:

1. Pilot Study Background Information
2. Program Information Form
3. Selection Process Form
4. Program Criteria Form
5. Evaluation Criteria Form

Please return the materials in the enclosed envelope to IYF, 67 W. Michigan Mall, Suite 608, Battle Creek, MI 49017 within three weeks of receipt.

IYF PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

1991 Pilot Study Background Information

The International Youth Foundation (IYF) exists to leverage people, ideas and resources on behalf of effective programs which promote the positive development of children and youth. IYF seeks to identify and support the replication of those programs which meet its criteria and effectively develop competence, character, confidence and connectedness in young people ages five - 20.

Therefore, a credible system to uncover, assess and catalogue these effective, reliable programs is among the most important elements of IYF's overall strategy. A task force of evaluation experts has worked over the past several months to develop a system to serve IYF's purposes.

The Program Identification System will be complemented by an Information Clearinghouse. Through IYF's Clearinghouse, foundations, funding agencies and NGO's will have access to a database of effective youth programs worth knowing and supporting.

Using the basic framework provided by this task force, we are asking several foundations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and intergovernmental agencies to assist us in a Pilot Study.

PILOT STUDY OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study is to commence the search for projects and programs of exceptional quality. The pilot study will also test IYF's system and instrument for soliciting nominations of the most effective, replicable programs which meet its criteria.

Our *primary* objective is to test how credible and effective a process we have designed to obtain data of a superior nature, and to check the value of IYF's criteria for identifying programs. The materials we collect from our respondents will be so analyzed and reviewed.

YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED

Participating foundations and organizations may want several questions answered before agreeing to help. Let's address some of the typical questions we have received.

What will our organization have to do?

IYF is asking a few, select foundations, NGOs and intergovernmental agencies to follow five steps:

First, to identify up to ten programs of exceptional quality which are directed towards children and youth between the ages of five and 20 and which have been, or have demonstrated capacity to be, replicated or expanded.

Second, to describe the projects/programs they identify.

Third, to indicate how they selected the particular projects/programs.

Fourth, to evaluate IYF's primary criteria for identifying and including projects/programs in its data base.

Fifth, to propose and assess evaluation criteria for youth projects/programs.

How will we benefit?

In two ways. First, the projects/programs which you nominate will be considered for inclusion in IYF's Information Clearinghouse. As they become known to other funders and organizations, they will have a greater chance of receiving the broader base of support needed to improve on their previous success and to expand their impact. They will also provide examples and contacts for others involved in programs for children and youth.

Second, once the Clearinghouse is launched in 1992, you will have access to the same valuable information, which will be useful for your grantmaking and programming.

Who else will participate?

In the first round of our study, the following organizations will be solicited:

Foundations

W.K. Kellogg Foundation (USA)
Bernard Van Leer Foundation (Netherlands)
Robert Bosch Foundation (Germany)
Moore Foundation (USA)
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (USA)

International Youth-Servicing NGOs

World Organization of Scouts Movement (Geneva)
League of Red Cross & Red Crescent Societies (Geneva)
Partners of the Americas (USA)
Ashoka: Innovators for the Public (USA)

Intergovernmental Agencies

World Health Organization (WHO)/Family Health Division, Adolescent Health Unit (Geneva)

Will additional organizations and foundations participate?

After determining the effectiveness of our system in the first round, we will make needed adjustments to the instrument. Approximately 20 additional foundations and organizations will then be contacted in a second round beginning in July.

How will you identify other programs which we do not select?

In addition to information solicited in the second round of this study, IYF has launched its initial efforts in Mexico and Poland to identify effective programs. In these countries, national leaders are assessing youth needs and identifying outstanding programs. National Screening Panels in each country will evaluate and recommend programs for inclusion in the Clearinghouse System which are culturally appropriate and which adhere to IYF criteria.

IYF will also tap *existing* databanks, including the National Diffusion Network (USA), The Foundation Center (USA), The European Foundation Center (Belgium), and other international databases (e.g. International Development Research Center). In addition, IYF will solicit materials electronically as a prelude to using the on-line database capabilities of the new Information Clearinghouse System it develops.

What if we do not have programs that match your criteria completely; can they be considered for IYF funding?

Yes. Those programs which have evaluations to validate their adherence to the criteria found on the Program Identification Form are eligible for consideration of funding, and will be

included in the IYF Clearinghouse. Programs which match some but not all of the criteria may be eligible for funding to strengthen their activities. Once subsequent evaluations validate that a program more completely matches IYF's criteria and/or is appropriate within a specific cultural context, it will be eligible for inclusion in the IYF information system.

How will you obtain more detailed information about the programs?

In addition to the materials you and the other pilot study participants provide, we will be contacting individual project/programs as well as informal advisors to obtain additional information. Once selected, the IYF Information Clearinghouse will solicit a wide variety of resources, directories, reports and other materials related to each program so that Clearinghouse users can get a very complete understanding of qualified projects/programs.

Will you conduct any on-site evaluation?

Indigenous staff and advisors will conduct on-site evaluations in countries where IYF establishes partnerships such as Mexico and Poland. Additionally, national screening panels made up of youth leaders and national experts of youth issues will review all programs in countries where IYF works.

Who else will evaluate these programs?

In addition to participants who nominate programs and the national screening panels, IYF's Board of Directors will appoint a panel of internationally recognized evaluators, program experts and youth leaders to serve as an Advisory Panel. This panel will review and make final recommendations for all proposal submissions which fall outside of countries with IYF operations (e.g. Mexico and Poland).

When will we be able to obtain the results of the Pilot Study?

Depending on how quickly we receive responses from the participants, we should have results for distribution to you by late July.

What happens after the Pilot Study?

First, IYF will modify its selection and evaluation criteria according to recommendations made by the pilot project participants.

Second, IYF will solicit program nominations from a broader network of NGOs, foundations, and intergovernmental agencies.

Third, the National Screening Panels of Mexico and Poland and the International Advisory Panel will begin to screen and recommend programs for inclusion in IYF's Clearinghouse.

Fourth, IYF will begin to make grants to effective youth programs, principally in Mexico and Poland.

Fifth, and simultaneously with the above, IYF will install and test the Information Clearinghouse System in preparation for making the data available and accessible to the international community.

More questions?

I am sure we have overlooked some. What are they? Please feel free to call me at (616) 969-0033 or our consultant, Mr. Bill Moss, at (703) 351-5055 with specific questions about the system.

How to Proceed

Attached are forms to obtain some basic information about the nominated programs, your selection process, program criteria, and evaluation criteria. We ask that you complete a set of forms for <u>each</u> program that you nominate.

The IYF system is still being developed. Your cooperation, suggestions and feedback will help us refine the system so it is really useful and valuable. We welcome your response and active participation in developing the system.

IYF PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

Program Information

1. Project/Program Nominated By (Name, Address, Telephone, FAX):

2. Program Name:_____

3. Program Location (Address, City, State or Province, Country):

4. Program Director or Contact Person (Name, Address, Telephone, FAX):

5. What are the primary goals, issues addressed and activities of the project/program?

(over)

6. Please check and/or specify the items that best describe the beneficiaries.

____age focus
____gender (male or female)
____family
____urban or rural
____socio-economic income (low, medium or high)

other:

7. What do you consider to be the most significant outcomes or impact of the program?

IYF PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

Selection Process

1. Why did you nominate this particular program for IYF? What were the important reasons guiding your selection?

2. What do you perceive to be this program's greatest two to three strengths?

3. What are your two to three most serious concerns about this program?

4. In your opinion, could this program effectively expand its current outreach and impact to more communities or be adapted to other settings? Explain.

IYF PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

Program Criteria

Project/Program Criteria

Programs to be considered for inclusion in the IYF information system and thereby eligible for replication funding would be selected based on a number of criteria which have been developed and refined over the past year through a consensus process involving experts and young people from many nations. The following list of criteria illustrate the "ideal" type of project for consideration.

Please indicate on the form below your estimate of how this program matches these criteria. For each criteria, please check (✓) the column which best describes the program. Also, please tell us how appropriate you think each criterion by indicating Yes (it is appropriate to use this criterion) or No (it is not appropriate to use this criterion.)

Criteria	Strongly Matches	Partially Matches	Does Not Match	Yes/No Appropriate
1. The program aims at the growth and development of children and youth, at one or more age levels between ages 5 and 20.				
2. The program focuses on prevention and early intervention rather than remediation or treatment.				
3. The program places its primary emphasis on promoting one or more of the following attributes:				
a. Competence - Helping young people to develop practical skills to sustain and improve the quality of life (e.g., literacy, employability, interpersonal skills, contribution to their culture, sensitivity to environmental issues, etc.);				
b. Connection - Developing caring human relationships (e.g., through mentoring, peer tutoring, peer counseling, intergenerational programs, leadership opportunities, etc.)				
c. Character - Promoting values that give meaning and direction (e.g., individual responsibility, honesty, community service, self-esteem, concern for equity, committed relationships, responsible decision-making, etc.)				

(over)

Criteria	Strongly Matches	Partially Matches	Does Not Match	Yes/No Appropriate?
d. Confidence - Providing experiences that lead to hope and self-esteem (e.g. early and sustained success experiences, goal-setting, etc.).				
4. The programs' activities are age and developmentally appropriate.				
5. The program is built on a community/neighborhood approach which includes:				
a. Involving several sectors of the community/neighborhood;	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Being responsive to identified needs;	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. A process for building community/neighborhood participation.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. The content, strategy and leadership of the program is appropriate to the culture of the involved community.				
7. The program includes features or components that appear to be appropriate also in other contexts.				
8. The program shows evidence of success in meeting identified needs of children or youth.				
9. The program serves or has excellent potential to serve a significant number of children or youth.				
10. The program provides a cost-effective means of achieving its goals.				
11. The program meaningfully involves parents and/or extended family or "significant adults."				
12. The program includes initial training, plus follow-up training and support for project staff and other participants as needed.				
13. The program provides monitoring, evaluation and feedback.				
14. The program involves youth in planning, implementation, evaluation and dissemination to the fullest extent possible.				
15. The program includes a feasible plan to become self-sustaining in financial support, in facilities and materials, in leadership and in continuing to address identified needs.				
16. The program is coordinated, as appropriate, with other child and youth services.				

IYF PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

Evaluation Criteria Form

1. What type of monitoring and/or evaluation has been conducted on the proposed program? Are there evaluation materials on this project that could be shared with IYF? Please list them.

2. Please indicate on the form below your assessment of the following evaluative criteria, checking the column which best describes the program. Also, indicate how you would modify the criteria to be more appropriate and realistic.

Criteria	Completely Appropriate & Realistic	Somewhat Appropriate & Realistic	Not Appropriate & Realistic
a. The program serves a significant number of people considering both the nature of the needs addressed & the level of financial investment. Modifications:			
b. The program results in sustained, favorable changes in participating youths' - behavior - attitudes - skills - relationships - opportunities Modifications:			

(over)

Criteria		Completely Appropriate & Realistic	Somewhat Appropriate & Realistic	Not Appropriate & Realistic
c.	The program results in sustained, favorable changes in participating youths' families' - behavior - attitudes - skills - relationships - opportunities Modifications:			
d.	The program results in communities' - improved attitude & acceptance of youth - increased activity benefitting youth Modifications:			
e.	The program is able to influence youth policies and practices - of local organizations - of the community - of local government - of the state or provincial government - of Federal government Modifications:			
f.	There has been sustained and effective implementation of services beyond the initial period of implementation Modifications:			

Pilot Study Results

PILOT STUDY RESULTS

Program Criteria Form

General Observations.

1. There were 29 programs nominated by the study participants, and 27 forms were received. The World Scouts were not able to respond due to time constraints. There was no explanation given for the missing evaluation forms for the Moore Foundation.

2. The participants were able to "match" their programs with IYF's 16 criteria items. Again, there may have been some bias in the responses to "strongly match" because of the "rewards" suggested at the beginning of the form.

3. About one third of the participants did not indicate whether the "criterion" items were "appropriate" to their programs. The wording of the directions may have caused some confusion; or they just didn't understand the purpose or meaning to the directions.

4. The data does reveal a less positive response to community-building and youth involvement as program criteria.

5. Three program nominations were described in Portuguese with no accompanying English translation, making it difficult to decipher program attributes.

Criteria Observations

1. The age levels ranged from preschools to older adults. Three of the projects seemed to consider ages 9-25 as "youth." Several age levels were described by developmental terminology ("early teens, late teens") or educational terminology ("preschool, K-6").

2. Most programs focused on prevention and early intervention.

3a. *Competence.* Most programs encouraged youth to develop practical skills to sustain and improve the quality of life, etc.

3b. *Connection.* Most programs emphasize developing caring human relationships.

3c. *Character.* Most programs promoted values that give meaning and direction.

3d. *Confidence.* Most programs provide experiences that lead to hope and self-esteem.

4. Most programs are age and developmentally appropriate.

5. The match of these programs to community/neighborhood criteria was more diversified because some programs focused on individual development rather than community development.

6. Most programs were culturally appropriate.

7. Most programs have features appropriate to other contexts.

8. Most programs show evidence of success in meeting needs of children or youth.

9. Most programs have excellent potential to serve significant numbers of children or youth.

10. Most programs at least partially cost-effective in achieving their goals.

11. The involvement of family members or "significant adults" received a mixed response. Both the quantitative and qualitative data indicate that matching this criteria depends upon the focus of the program, i.e. whether it is adolescent development or family development.

12. Most programs include initial training and follow-up training.

13. Most programs provide monitoring, evaluation and feedback.

14. Depending upon the focus of the program, youth were involved in planning, implementation and dissemination of the program. Two-thirds of the programs did not match or only partially matched this criteria.

15. Most programs do not have a feasible plan to become self-sustaining. This may indicate an opportunity for IYF to contribute training and technical assistance.

16. Over half of the programs are partially coordinated with other child and youth services. Several of the programs are not related to child and youth service organizations.

Evaluation Criteria Form

General Observations.

1. Three sources provided a few recommended modifications of the criteria. Directions for the use of "modifications" need to be stated more clearly.

2. Most of the education programs and almost all of the programs submitted by foundations have fairly strong evaluation efforts in place. Less developed evaluation efforts were indicated in programs submitted by NGO's.

Criteria Observations

1. Most participants reported some type of evaluation was in progress, whether through highly formal procedures conducted by external evaluators or staff-reported internal evaluations. Foundations seems to conduct more evaluation efforts than do NGO's. Please refer to descriptive information.

2.a. Most programs serve a significant number of people considering the needs and level of financial investment.

2b. Most programs result sustained, favorable changes in youth participants.

2.c. Most programs submitted were not designed for family participation. Whatever favorable changes take place are seen as "spin-off" effects.

2d. Most programs seem to improve community attitudes and acceptance of youth, and they increase youth activities benefitting youth.

2e. The farther removed from local efforts, the less the programs were able to influence policy. Influence at higher levels of policy-making seems to be less a factor and more inappropriate among these participants.

2f. Most programs are sustained and remain effective beyond their initial implementation.

Round One Participants

ROUND ONE PARTICIPANTS

SOURCE	PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION
World Scouts	Did not submit programs at this time.	
W.K. Kellogg Jack Mawdsley & Dr. Joel Arosz	1. Boys & Girls Club of Newark 35 James Street Mr. Barbara Wright-Bell Newark, NJ 07102-2001 Tel. 201-242-1200	Urban youth employment and entrepreneurial training program.
	2. Five Star Project/Urban Education Alliance Dr. Sylvia Jones Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, MI 48197 Tel. 313-487-0447	Pre-school education for disadvantaged children in 5 urban Michigan school districts.
	3. Kalamazoo Public Schools Dr. Martha Warfield 1220 Howard St. Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1882 Tel. 616-344-9411	Community-based education program for minority student achievement, grades K-6.
	4. National Youth Leadership Council James C. Kielsmeier, President 1910 West County Road B, #216 Roseville, MN 551133 Tel. 612-631-3672	Youth service initiative for K-8 in curriculum development and teacher training.
	5. Oakland University Dr. Donald M. Miller Rochester, MI 48309-4401 Tel. 313-370-4233	Curriculum development program for university program focused on grades Pre-school-3.
	6. Skills for Growing Dave Miller QUEST International 537 Jones Road PO Box 566 Granville, OH 43023-0566	Interpersonal skills and positive youth development program for elementary and middle school children.
	7. SPACES Michigan 4H Foundation Dr. Christine Nelson Family & Child Ecology 6-H Berkey Hall Michigan State University East Lansing, MI 48824-1111 Tel. 517-355-0180	Use of hi tech for youth to teach personal coping skills and cultural awareness.

SOURCE	PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION
Kellogg cont.	8. The Nation of Tomorrow Dr. Lascellas Anderson University of Illinois at Chicago College of Education PO Box 4348, MC 147 Chicago, IL 60680 Tel. 312-991-6263	Child and youth development for poverty-level children in four urban Chicago neighborhoods.
	9. Volunteers Impacting Youth Dr. Freddye Groomes Florida State University Tallahassee, FL 32306-1049 Tel. 904-644-5283	Tutoring and mentoring program for disadvantaged K-3 elementary students utilizing volunteers.
	10. Youth Helping Youth Tom Erney Alternatives Counseling & Consultation Center 2631 NW 41st Street, Suite E-6 Gainesville, FL 32606	One of the oldest, the Bucholz peer facilitator program engages youth to help youth develop life skills.
Van Leer Foundation	11. Servol Limited Fr. Gerard Pantin 91 Frederick Street Port of Spain, Trinidad West Indies Tel. 623-5308/623-6746	Holistic adolescent development for ages 16-19.
	12. RADIAL Project Alberto Melo Associacão IN LOCO Apartado 603 8000 Faro, Portugal Tel. 011-351-89-25063	Rural redevelopment program and Child Development Centres which provide vocational training, women's micro-enterprise development, and teacher training.
Moore Foundation	13. Starehe Boys Centre and School Mr. Geoffrey Griffin PO Box 30178 Nairobi, Kenya	Remedial education and intervention program for at-risk Kenyan boys, grades K-12.
Bosch Foundation	14. Employment Projects in Youth Welfare Fed. Republic of Germany	Educational and vocational training for at-risk youth ages 17-25.
	15. Integration through Kindergarten Education Program Berlin, Munich and Stuttgart	Kindergarten for German and non-German migrant parents and their children, ages 3-5.
	16. German-Polish Student Exchange Robert Bosch Foundation, Stuttgart	Student exchange for international understanding and cooperation for students ages 16-18.

SOURCE	PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION
Bosch cont.	17. Catch-Up Courses Duisburg, Stuttgard, Cologne Hamburg, Frankfurt, Munich	Remedial education for non-German youth to learn social work and nursing.
	18. Relevance of Education to Life Dr. Peter Fauser Tubingen University Erziehungswissenschaftl Seminar I Munzgasse, 7400 Tubingen Fed. Rep. of Germany	Educational enrichment program using arts and crafts, etc. for youth ages 6-18.
Red Cross	19. Youth on the Line Jens Rasmussen Danish Red Cross Århusgade 102 D 2100 Copenhagen Dem,ark Tel. 011-45-31-26-14-20	Telephone hot line managed by youth provides counsel, personal support and encouragement.
	20. Sungai Lalang Village Adoption Programme Datin Paduka Ruby Lee Secretary General Malaysian Red Crescent Society JKR 32, Jalan Nipah, Off Jalan Ampang 55000 Kuala Lumpur Malaysia	Health care and prevention for aboriginal village youth provided by youth volunteers.
	21. Challenge Cancer Support Network David Rogers Victoria Division Australia Red Cross Society 206 Clarendon Street East Melbourne 3002, Australia	Support and counseling for children ages 4-14 and their families; services provided by youth volunteers.
Red Cross	22. Soil Conservation Project Roland C. Mokoma Lesoth Red Cross Society Box 366 Maseru 100, Lesotho Tel. 011-266-313-911	Agricultural development program organized through schools and villages.
	23. Environment Protection Program Callist Kainamura Uganda Red Cross Society PO Box 494 Kampala, Uganda Tel. 011-256-231-480/ 258-701or702	Environmental education and awareness campaign for youth ages 9-25.

SOURCE	PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION
	24. Action for Youth Aids Prevention and Control Uganda Red Cross Society PO Box 494 Kampala, Uganda Tel. 011-256-231-480/ 258-701or702	Aids prevention among youth thru mobilizing and development of youth leadership, ages 9-25.
FFAB	25. Projeto Meninos e Meninas de Rua e de Favelas Fundacão Fé e Alegria de Brasil Rua São Clemente, 226 Botafogo 22-260 Brasil	Educational intervention for at-risk youth in the favelas.
	26. Projeto Saúde da Comunidade (PSC)	Community development for adults.
	27. Projeto Creches Comunitárias (PCC)	Child care and development.

Frequency Reports:

1. Program Evaluation Criteria

2. Evaluation Criteria

IYF PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

Program Criteria

Project/Program Criteria

Programs to be considered for inclusion in the IYF information system and thereby eligible for replication funding would be selected based on a number of criteria which have been developed and refined over the past year through a consensus process involving experts and young people from many nations. The following list of criteria illustrate the "ideal" type of project for consideration.

Please indicate on the form below your estimate of how this program matches these criteria. For each criteria, please check (✓) the column which best describes the program. Also, please tell us how appropriate you think each criterion by indicating Yes (it is appropriate to use this criterion) or No (it is not appropriate to use this criterion.)

Criteria	Strongly Matches	Partially Matches	Does Not Match	Yes/No Appropriate?
1. The program aims at the growth and development of children and youth, at one or more age levels between ages 5 and 20.	22	2	3	Y - 19 N - 1
2. The program focuses on prevention and early intervention rather than remediation or treatment.	19	4	4	Y - 19 N - 1
3. The program places its primary emphasis on promoting one or more of the following attributes:				
a. *Competence* - Helping young people to develop practical skills to sustain and improve the quality of life (e.g., literacy, employability, interpersonal skills, contribution to their culture, sensitivity to environmental issues, etc.);	23	4		Y - 19 N - 1
b. *Connection* - Developing caring human relationships (e.g., through mentoring, peer tutoring, peer counseling, intergenerational programs, leadership opportunities, etc.)	17	5	5	Y - 17 N - 3
c. *Character* - Promoting values that give meaning and direction (e.g., individual responsibility, honesty, community service, self-esteem, concern for equity, committed relationships, responsible decision-making, etc.)	21	6		Y - 19 N - 1

(over)

Criteria	Strongly Matches	Partially Matches	Does Not Match	Yes/No Appropriate
d. Confidence - Providing experiences that lead to hope and self-esteem (e.g. early and sustained success experiences, goal-setting, etc.).	19	7	1	Y - 17 N - 0
4. The programs' activities are age and developmentally appropriate.	24	2	0	Y - 17 N - 0
5. The program is built on a community/neighborhood approach which includes:				
a. Involving several sectors of the community/neighborhood;	15	6	6	Y - 12 N - 4
b. Being responsive to identified needs;	17	7	2	Y - 15 N - 2
c. A process for building community/neighborhood participation.	13	8	5	Y - 15 N - 3
6. The content, strategy and leadership of the program is appropriate to the culture of the involved community.	23	4	0	Y - 17 N - 1
7. The program includes features or components that appear to be appropriate also in other contexts.	20	6	1	Y - 18 N - 0
8. The program shows evidence of success in meeting identified needs of children or youth.	23	1	3	Y - 18 N - 0
9. The program serves or has excellent potential to serve a significant number of children or youth.	19	7	1	Y - 17 N - 1
10. The program provides a cost-effective means of achieving its goals.	15	12	1	Y - 18 N - 0
11. The program meaningfully involves parents and/or extended family or "significant adults."	13	11	3	Y - 17 N - 1
12. The program includes initial training, plus follow-up training and support for project staff and other participants as needed.	18	8	1	Y - 18 N - 0
13. The program provides monitoring, evaluation and feedback.	22	4		Y - 17 N - 1
14. The program involves youth in planning, implementation, evaluation and dissemination to the fullest extent possible.	10	8	9	Y - 14 N - 4
15. The program includes a feasible plan to become self-sustaining in financial support, in facilities and materials, in leadership and in continuing to address identified needs.	5	19	3	Y - 17 N - 1
16. The program is coordinated, as appropriate, with other child and youth services.	12	15	0	Y - 18 N - 0

IYF PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

Evaluation Criteria Form

1. What type of monitoring and/or evaluation has been conducted on the proposed program? Are there evaluation materials on this project that could be shared with IYF? Please list them.

2. Please indicate on the form below your assessment of the following evaluative criteria, checking the column which best describes the program. Also, indicate how you would modify the criteria to be more appropriate and realistic.

Criteria	Completely Appropriate & Realistic	Somewhat Appropriate & Realistic	Not Appropriate & Realistic
a. The program serves a significant number of people considering both the nature of the needs addressed & the level of financial investment. Modifications:	21	6	
b. The program results in sustained, favorable changes in participating youths' Modifications:			
- behavior	21	3	0
- attitudes	20	4	0
- skills	20	3	1
- relationships	19	3	0
- opportunities	17	5	0

(over)

Criteria		Completely Appropriate & Realistic	Somewhat Appropriate & Realistic	Not Appropriate & Realistic
c.	The program results in sustained, favorable changes in participating youths' families'			
	- behavior	8	11	2
	- attitudes	6	12	2
	- skills	6	10	5
	- relationships	6	10	2
	- opportunities	4	11	4
	Modifications:			
d.	The program results in communities'			
	- improved attitude & acceptance of youth	15	5	3
	- increased activity benefitting youth	15	5	3
	Modifications:			
e.	The program is able to influence youth policies and practices			
	- of local organizations	14	6	0
	- of the community	13	6	0
	- of local government	9	11	2
	- of the state or provincial government	6	8	7
	- of Federal government	3	4	8
	Modifications:			
f.	There has been sustained and effective implementation of services beyond the initial period of implementation	13	4	3
	Modifications:			

Analysis Matrices

ANALYSIS OF IYF PILOT STUDY - ROUND ONE

SOURCE	PROGRAM NAME	PROGRAM FOCUS	GENDER FOCUS	AGE GROUP	PROGRAM LOCATION	ECONOMIC LEVEL	PROGRAM CRITERIA		Competence	Connection	Character	Confidence	Dev.Approp.	Comm.Sectors	Ident. Needs
							Age 5-20	Intervention							
KELLOGG	1 B&G Club	Micro-Enterp.	M-F	Mid-Late Teen	Urban	Low	X		X	X	X	X	X		
	2 S Star	Education	M-F	Preschool	Urban	Low		X	X		X		X	X	X
	3 Kal.Pub.Sch.	Education	M-F	K-6	Urban	Low	X	X	X	N	X	X	X	X	X
	4 NYLC	Educaton	Both	K-8	Urban/Rural	All	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N	X
	5 Oakland U	Education	M-F	Pre-3	Urban/Rural	Mixed	X	X	X	N	X	X	X	X	
	6 Quest Skills	Youth Dev't	M-F	K-6	Urban/Rural	All	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N	X
	7 Spaces/4H	Youth Dev't	M-F	Early Teens	Urban/Rural	All	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	N	X
	8 Nat.Tomorr.	Youth Dev't	M-F	K-8	Urban	Low	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	9 Vol.Imp.You.	Mentoring	M-F	K-3		Low	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	10 YouthHelp	Peer Facilitator	M-F	K-12	Urban/Rural	All	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Van LEER	11 Servol	Youth Dev't	M-F	16-19	Urban	Low	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	12 Radial	Child Dev./Ed.		Children	Urban/Rural	All	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MOORE	12 Starehe	Youth Dev't	M	6-18	Urban/Rural	Low	N/A								
BOSCH	14 Emply.Yo.	Youth Employ.	M-F	17-25	Urban/Rural	Low	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	15 Integ.Educ.	Child Dev't/Ed.	M-F	3-5	Urban	Low	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
	16 Ger-Pol Ex	Student Exch.	M-F	16-18	Urban/Rural	All	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	O	O
	17 Transfer	Remed.Educ.	M-F	17-25	Urban	Low	X		X	X	X	X	X	N	N
	18 Relev.Educ.	Education	M-F	6-18	Urban/Rural	All	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X N	X
RED CROSS	19 Y.OnLine	Hot Line	M-F	18-20	Urban/Rural	All	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
	20 Sungai	Health	M-F	Youth	Rural	Low	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	21 Challenge	Child Counsel	M-F	4-14	Urban/Rural	All	X	X		N	X	X	X	X	X
	22 Soil Cons.	Agricultural					X	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	23 Env.Prot.	Environ.Educ.	M-F	9-25			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	24 Action	Health/Aids	M-F	9-25	Urban/Rural		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FFAB	25 Men.E.Me	Child. Educ.	M-F	7-17	Urban	All	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	26 Saude	Comm.Dev't	M-F	Adults	Urban	Low	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	27 Creches	Child Health	M-F	0-6	Urban	Low	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

KEY : X = Match or Partial Match; Blank = Does Not Match; O = Left Blank or No Response;

N = Not Appropriate; XN = Match but Not Appropriate

| | | |

ANALYSIS OF IYF PILOT STUDY - ROUND ONE

		EVALUATION CRITERIA								
SOURCE	PROGRAM NAME	Sig. Minvest	Y. Behavior	Y. Attitudes	Y. Skills	Y. Relations	Y. Opportunty	F.Behavior	F. Attitudes	F. Skills	F. Relations
KELLOGG	1 B&G Club	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	2 S Star	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	3 Kal.Pub.Sch.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early
	4 NYLC	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early
	5 Oakland U	X	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
	6 Quest Skills	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	7 Spaces/4-H	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
	8 Nat.Tomorr.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	9 Vol.Imp.You.	X	X	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O
	10 Youth-Help	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Van LEER	11 Servol	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	12 Radial	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MOORE	13 Starehe	X	X	X	X	X	X	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early
BOSCH	14 Emply.Yo.	X	X	X	X	X	X				
	15 Integ.Educ.	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
	16 Ger-Pol Ex	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	17 Transfer	X	O	X	X	O	X				
	18 Relev.Educ.	X	X	X	X	O	O	X	X	X	O
RED CROSS	19 Y.OnLine	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	O	O	O
	20 Sungai	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	O	O	O
	21 Challenge	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	O	O	O
	22 Soil Cons.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	23 Env.Prot.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	24 Action	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
FFAB	25 Men.E.Me	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	26 Saude	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	27 Creches	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

KEY : X = Match or Partial Match; Blank = Does Not Match; O = Left Blank or No Response;
N = Not Appropriate; XN = Match but Not Appropriate

F. Opportunity	Comm.Attitude	Comm. Activity	Pol.Local Org.	Pol. Communit	Pol. Local Govt	Pol. State Govt	Pol. Fed. Govt.	Sust. Implem.	PROGRAM
									NAME
X			X	X	X	X	X		1 B&G Club
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	2 5 Star
Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	3 Kal.Pub.Sch.
Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	4 NYLC
"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5 Oakland U
X	X	X	X	X	X			X	6 Quest Skills
			X	X				X	7 Spaces/4H
	X	X	X	X				X	8 Nat.Tomorr.
O	X	X	X	X	X	O	O		9 Vol.Imp.You.
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10 YouthHelp
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	11 Servol
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	12 Radial
Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	Too Early	13 Starehe
	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	14 Emply.Yo.
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	15 Integ.Educ.
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	16 Ger-Pol Ex
			X	X	X	X	O	O	17 Transfer
O	X	X	O	X	X	X	O	X	18 Relev.Educ.
O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	19 Y.OnLine
O	X	X	O	O	O	O	O	X	20 Sungai
O	X	X	O	O	O	O	O	X	21 Challenge
X	X	X	X	X				O	22 Soil Cons.
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	23 Env.Prot.
X	X	X	X	X	X			X	24 Action
X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	25 Men.E.Me
X	X	X	X	X	X			X	26 Saude
X	X	X	X	X	X			O	27 Creches